



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,215	09/25/2003	Bruce R. Booth	AUS920030296US1	4076
35525	7590	10/04/2007		
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER	
			FEARER, MARK D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,215

Applicant(s)

BOOTH ET AL.

Examiner

Mark D. Fearer

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,10-14,16,19-23 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,10-14,16,19-23 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 23 July 2007 is acknowledged.
- Claims 1-5, 7, 10-13, 16, 19-23, and 25 have been amended.
- Claims 6, 8-9, 15, 17-18, 24, and 26-27 are cancelled.
- Claims 1-5, 7, 10-14, 16, 19-23, and 25 are still pending in the present application.
- This action is made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakivaya et al. (US 20040267876 A1) in view of Belfiore et al. (US 6990513 B2).

Consider claims 1, 10, and 19. Kakivaya et al. discloses a method in a data processing system for providing a single automation tool adapter for use with multiple different automation tools, said method comprising the steps of: monitoring a plurality of clients for automation requests ((“Discovery clients 110-111 may monitor Announce and ByeBye messages to maintain a list of the devices and services available on the network 120 by listening to the discovery IPv4 URL, if they are IPv4 capable, and to discovery IPv6 URL, if they are IPv6 capable; dual stack discovery clients monitor both addresses.”) paragraph 0241); receiving, from one of said plurality of clients, an automation request in an original format to be executed within one of said automation tools ((“The discovery device simply responds to all matching discovery requests, whether from a discovery client or from a discovery server.”) paragraph 0005); determining a second format required by said one of said automation tools; converting

said automation request from said original format to said second format; and submitting said automation request in said second format to said one of said automation tools for processing, wherein automation requests are submitted to one of said automation tools in a format required by said one of said automation tools ((“The configuration number enables controlled caching of the description of the service or device. The configuration number is associated with the configuration of the service or device. If the configuration changes, then the configuration number also changes. When the announcement message is received, the recipient (e.g., discovery server or discovery client) can use the endpoint identifier to check for the presence of a cached description of the service or device in its local cache. The recipient then compares the configuration number to check whether the cached description is up to date.”) paragraph 0009). However, Kakivaya et al. fails to disclose a method in a data processing system for providing a single automation tool adapter for use with multiple different automation tools comprising a queue listener, a verb dispatcher, or a reply server. Belfiore et al. discloses a distributed services computing platform comprising event polling and listening, a unified command/search line which parses and brokers out a query or command to services (read as dispatcher), and at least a second server for responding to network events ((“Event composition 608 aggregates, filters, and transforms lower-level events (atomic events 606) into higher-level events 612 and, at times, maps the events directly into actions, such as world action 614. The actions include real-world actions 614 and information-gathering actions 616 that serve to gather new events via actively polling or listening. Event composition 608 provides methods for combining

events and data, whether the events are observed in close temporal proximity or at widely different times. Event-specific language 618 and composition compiler 620 may be used for building composition components. Event composition 608 may employ a variety of methods, ranging across a spectrum of sophistication from simple rules and filters to richer temporal pattern matching and frank logical and probabilistic inference in order to combine the events and data.") column 21 lines 4-19 ("The unified command/search line parses and brokers out the query or command to services provided both locally and on the network. It exists in one place in the user interface, accessed the same way, no matter where they are, and all forms of input--typed (keyboard), spoken, handwritten may be received by the user interface. All levels of intelligence--keyword, Boolean, and natural language (fragments, noun phrases, and/or well formed sentences) may also be received and processed by the user interface.") column 18 lines 50-58 ("The universal listener can further dispatch requests to user-mode "worker processes" based on the longest match URL prefix. These user-mode applications have complete isolation from the core listener component. The worker process can receive and respond to requests using a "UL API." Moreover, worker processes services multiple parts of the URL name space. More than one worker process ("a garden") can service the same set of applications for increased scalability, availability and intra-application isolation.") column 27 lines 46-55 ("... the first server determining that further information is needed from at least a second server in order to respond to the network request based on the recognized meaning of the network request; ...") claim 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate distributed services computing platform comprising event polling and listening, a unified command/search line which parses and brokers out a query or command to services, and at least a second server for responding to network events as taught by Belfiore et al. with a method in a data processing system for providing a single automation tool adapter for use with multiple different automation tools, said method comprising the steps of: monitoring a plurality of clients for automation requests; receiving, from one of said plurality of clients, an automation request in an original format to be executed within one of said automation tools; determining a second format required by said one of said automation tools; converting said automation request from said original format to said second format; and submitting said automation request in said second format to said one of said automation tools for processing, wherein automation requests are submitted to one of said automation tools in a format required by said one of said automation tools as taught by Kakivaya et al. for the purpose of application integration.

Consider claims 2, 11, and 20, and as applied to claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Kakivaya et al., as modified by Belfiore et al., discloses a method wherein said steps of monitoring a plurality of clients for automation requests and receiving, from one of said plurality of clients, an automation request further includes the steps of: providing a plurality of request queues; and checking each one of said plurality of request queues for a message ("... In multicast mode, the devices whose device or

service description matches the query return a response (a find response message) directly to the sender ...") paragraph 0040).

Consider claims 3, 12, and 21, and as applied to claims 2, 11, and 20, respectively. Kakivaya et al., as modified by Belfiore et al., discloses a method further comprising the steps of: each one of said plurality of request queues being located in a different one of said plurality of clients ("Further, the discovery client can use parameters in its discovery query to retrieve a single "page" amount of responses at a time from the discovery server (which, for example, can be a number of entries that can be displayed as a page by the discovery client). In one implementation, the discovery client can specify a size limit and page context in its discovery query. The discovery server responds with up to the size limit of matching entries in its cache of service and device descriptions, and returns the page context and status indicating whether the query is complete. The discovery client can continue to request further "pages" in subsequent queries using the size limit and returned page context.") paragraph 0014).

Consider claims 4, 13, and 22, and as applied to claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Kakivaya et al., as modified by Belfiore et al., discloses a method comprising the steps of: determining said second format required by said one of said automation tools utilizing a configuration file that includes a specification of a format for each one of said plurality of automation tools ("The scope information is used to control the scope of queries in large networks. It can be set by an explicit configuration of a device, or it can be associated to the device identifier in the database of a discovery server. A device may be present in multiple scopes.") paragraph 0085).

Consider claims 5, 14, and 23, and as applied to claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Kakivaya et al., as modified by Belfiore et al., discloses a method comprising the steps of: receiving said automation request in said original format which is an XML document format ((“The ad-hoc service discovery protocol uses several Extensible Markup Language (XML) formats for its message exchanges.”) paragraph 0044); and converting said automation request from said XML document format to a flat file containing a set of name/value pairs, wherein said flat file format is said second format ((“FIG. 3 (including parts A-F) is a listing of an XML schema defining message types in the ad-hoc discovery protocol.”) paragraph 0018).

Claims 7, 16, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakivaya et al. (US 20040267876 A1) in view of Belfiore et al. (US 6990513 B2) and in further view of Wong et al. (US 6968364 B1).

Regarding claims 7, 16, and 25 and as applied to claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Kakivaya et al., as modified by Belfiore et al., discloses a method of a unique identifier in each one of a plurality of received requests. This reads on the claimed “...comprising the steps of: including a unique identifier in each one of a plurality of received automation requests ...” (paragraph 0042). However, Kakivaya et al., as modified by Belfiore et al., fails to teach using the unique identifier to track each received automation request. Wong et al. discloses a method wherein requests are tracked by their unique identification number. This reads on the claimed “...tracking each one of said plurality of received automation requests utilizing said unique identifier.” ((“The token GUID uniquely identifies the token so that the token may be

Art Unit: 2143

tracked and/or corresponding transaction information may be linked back to a token request and the individual making the request.”) column 43 lines 19-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the tracking methods as taught by Wong et al. with the information received of unique identifiers as taught by Kakivaya et al., as modified by Belfiore et al., for the purpose of tracking an automation request by its unique identifier.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 23 July 2007 with respect to claims 1-5, 7, 10-13, 16, 19-23, and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2143

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Mark Fearer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1770. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Mark Fearer
M.D.F./mdf
September 28, 2007


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 21